

MINUTES AND LEGAL ACTION REPORT

BARRIO HISTORICO HISTORIC DISTRICT ADVISORY BOARD

MONDAY, JANUARY 14, 2019, 4:00 PM

LOWER LEVEL MEETING ROOM

101 N. STONE AVE, TUCSON, AZ 85701

AGENDA

1. Roll Call

A quorum was present: Ken Bacher, Robert Boss, Karen Costello, Jody Gibbs, Mary Lou Heuett, Paul Horbatt.

2. Call to the Audience

No one spoke.

3. Minutes of November 28, Meeting

MOTION ONE - Ken Bacher moved and Mary Lou Heuett seconded to approve the minutes.

VOTE ONE – The vote was 6 yes to 0 no to approve the Minutes

4. BOARD ADMINISTRATION INCLUDING COMPLETE SUCCINCT APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS, HARD LINE COPIES, COPIES OF THE HPZ SECTIONS, LOT SPLITS IN THE HISTORIC ZONE

MOTION TWO – Ken Bacher moved and Robert Boss seconded that the Advisory Board request that the PDSD Staff and the City Preservation Office meet with the Advisory Board to discuss following items in the HPZ Applications and in the HPZ Review Process.

- 1) Elimination from Applications of photos of buildings that are not historic.
- 2) Elimination from Applications of photos of buildings that are not in the project's Development Zone.
- 3) Inclusion in Applications of a clear photo of the Development Zone area plus adequate photos and drawings to indicate clearly the "typical" "prevailing" Design Criteria Characteristics of the Historic Buildings in the Development Zone including but not limited to Roof Type, front/side/rear Setbacks, Site Utilization, Building Form, Building Size, Location and Number of Off Street Parking Spaces, Percentage of Lot in Open Space, Percentage of Lot covered by Building and pavement, Streetscapes, Building Materials, Rhythm, Proportions, Heights, Windows and Doors, etc.
- 4) Inclusion in Applications of clear drawings including: Development Zone Map indicating the Historic Buildings, the information on the Historic Buildings indicated in item 3) above, Site Plan, Floor Plan, Elevations, Roof Plan, Details, Landscape Plan, and plus Building Sections and Drainage/ Topography Plan when necessary to clarify intent. Such plans and drawings need to be clear, scaled, noted, dimensioned, and of sufficient size to be easily understood.

5) Elimination of irrelevant information from Applications including rhetoric such as " meets the Code", " follows the Design Criteria", " is compatible", etc.

6) Provision of a Hard copies of proposals to each member of the Advisory Board one week prior to review of the proposal by the Advisory Board.

7) Provision of spiral bound a Xerox copy of the applicable provisions of HPZ sections to each member of the Advisory Board that can be consulted when reviewing applications.

8) Advisory Board review of proposed Lot Splits in the Historic Zone prior to PDSD or City approval of Lot Splits.

VOTE TWO – The vote was 6 yes to 0 no to request such a meeting to discuss such items.

5. HPZ 18-90, Meyer/Kennedy/Simpson, 13New Housing Units, Bob Lanning Architect.

Bob Lanning explained that he had not been able to meet the requests from the Commission to screen the visibility of the garage doors and the second floor dormer windows and balconies from the interior street entries on Kennedy and Simpson.

He also said that any second floor balcony would be faced into the new interior street and that the second floor dormer windows would be "screened".

Under questioning from Advisory Board Member Paul Horbatt, the architect acknowledged that no provision or covenant had been made to prevent owners from removing the "screens".

Jody Gibbs stated that diagonal views of the project from Main, Simpson, Meyer, and Simpson would still expose any second story balcony and second story dormer windows from which the screen had been removed.

At the Advisory Board's last review of this project the Advisory Board voted that the proposal was "NOT COMPATIBLE" with the surrounding Historic Properties in the Development Zone regarding SITE UTILIZATION, BUILDING FORM, CHARACTER, STREETScape ON THE INTERIOR STREET, and OPEN SPACE. Nothing has been changed in the current revisions to address these concerns.

Karen Costello said she was very concerned that the new interior street was still blocked and did not continue through from Kennedy to Simpson, but she wished to recommend the project for approval.

Robert Boss said he wished to recommend approval because the proposal was better than previous schemes and he thought it unlikely the Board would receive a better scheme from the applicant.

Jody Gibbs pointed out that the revisions presented did not correct the garage door and second story balcony visibility concerns raised by the Commission, nor did the revisions correct the "NOT COMPATIBLE" items cited by the Advisory Board in their last review including SITE UTILIZATION, BUILDING FORM, CHARACTER, STREETScape ON THE INTERIOR STREET, and OPEN SPACE .

He pointed out that the role of the Reviewing Bodies are to make recommendations based upon whether a proposal is "Compatible" or "Not Compatible" with the Historic Buildings in the Development Zone using the Design Criteria.

He also pointed out that site coverage, open space, lot size, building size, setbacks, and number of stories on the Historic Buildings in the Development Zone are all numeric and distinctly different from the same criteria in the proposal, and that there are no second story balconies on any Historic Building in the Development Zone.

Lastly he said that fatigue of reviewing proposals from this applicant for more than year and pessimism of ever receiving a scheme with fewer units, more open space and a different character should not be reasons for approval; and that vacant land is less damaging to the Historic Zone than non-compatible “replica” buildings

MOTION THREE – Karen Costello moved and Robert Boss seconded to recommend the proposal.

VOTE THREE – The vote was 4 yes to 2 no (Gibbs, Horbatt dissenting) to recommend approval.

6. HPZ 18-91, 625 S. OSBORNE AVE, NEW HOUSE, TWW DESIGN

Some Board members were still unable to download all the drawings.

MOTION FOUR – Mary Lou Heuett moved and Ken Bacher seconded to continue the review until all Board members had all the drawings.

MOTION FOUR – The vote was 6 yes to 0 no to continue the review.

7. HPZ 18-92, 625 S. OSBORNE, NEW HOUSE, TWW DESIGN

Some Board member were still unable to download all the drawings.

MOTION FIVE – Mary Lou Heuett moved and Ken Bacher seconded to continue the review

VOTE FIVE – The vote was 6 yes to 0 no to continue the review

8. HPZ 19-01, 625 S. 9TH AVE, NEW HOUSE, ARCHITECT CHABAN DESIGN LLC

Philipp Neher presented. He was requested to send Michael Taku copies of the material on the three large boards he used to supplement the material previously submitted.

MOTION SIX – Karen Costello moved and Jody Gibbs seconded to recommend approval.

VOTE SIX was 6 yes and 0 no to recommend approval.

9. HPZ 19-02, 615 S. 9TH AVE, NEW HOUSE, ACRHITECT CHABAN LLC

Philipp Neher presented. He was requested to send Michael Taku copies of the material on the three large boards he used to supplement the material previously submitted.

MOTION SEVEN – Jody Gibbs moved and KEN Bacher seconded to recommend approval.

VOTE SEVEN- The vote was 6 yes to 0 no to recommend approval.

10. Adjournment - the meeting adjourned at 6:00 PM.